

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 93 08:08:19 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1200
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 9 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1200

Today's Topics:

"safe" cars for mobile VHF/UHF?
 AEA's ATV
 Cordless phone Band????
 I LOVE CW!!!! (2 msgs)
 MOTOROLA
 Motorola ad in QST? (4 msgs)
 Temporary IDs

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 1993 14:35:58 GMT
From: world!jwm@uunet.uu.net
Subject: "safe" cars for mobile VHF/UHF?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm in the market for a new car. Obviously(?), one of the first things
I will do after picking up the car is install a mobile VHF/UHF
transceiver. I've read about problems that hams have had with the
engine CPU in certain cars--most notably Toyotas--getting fried by a
40-watt ham xcvr operated from the car. Obviously, this is an
important factor for me in which cars I will consider buying.

Has anyone compiled a list of "problem" cars? Have you had problems
with your ham xcvr interfering with your car's electronics? If so, to
what degree, and was the "damage" permanent? Please respond directly
to me via e-mail at jwm@world.std.com; I will summarize the results

and post. If there is interest, I will make the results available for the FAQ.

Take care and 73 de
Jon N1ILZ

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 23:44:48 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!nextnet!
monsoor@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: AEA's ATV
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am looking for information on Advanced Electronic Applications Amiga Video Terminal (AVT) System. Did it work well, is it still supported, what would a used one cost? What is it?? This is what I know about the System:

"The Amiga Video Terminal System is a revolutionary Hardware/software package that enables the Amiga user to send and receive images over the telephone or a radio transceiver. Images are converted to a digitally synthesized analog format which takes advantage of the data bandwidth to provide full-color images on the computer screen in as little as 12 seconds. Modes are also available for detailed images taking as long as three minutes for a 320 by 400 transfer. The System also supports analog facsimile high resolution (1024 horizontal by 1200 vertical) 16 level grey-scale images

Additional features include:

On-screen tuning oscilloscope
SSTV mode-to-mode conversion
Five software selectable input ports
Interference correction modes
55 SSTV modes
Up to 4,096 simultaneous colors
SSTV resolution up to 640 by 400 pixels
GEOSFAX (with adapter), WEFAX, NEWSFAX
SSTV auto mode detection
3D capability with user supplied LCD shutter goggles
Compatible with Amiga 500, 1000, 2000 and 2500 computers with a minimum of one megabyte of ram (1.5 Mbytes or more recommended)"

Thanks in advance, 73's
N6ZSK@KM6PX-1.USA.WS.NC <- not sure of correct address for N Cal.

--

```
+-----+
| Matthew G. Monsoor | USMAIL: 6000 J st., Sacramento, Ca 95819-6091 |
| (916) 278-6288 | Internet: monsoor@csus.edu |
+-----+
```

--

```
+-----+
| Matthew G. Monsoor | USMAIL: 6000 J st., Sacramento, Ca 95819-6091 |
| (916) 278-6288 | Internet: monsoor@csus.edu |
+-----+
```

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 22:41:26 EST
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Cordless phone Band????
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

mittchell@leotech.mv.com (Scott Mitchell) writes:

> Does anyone know the frequency range that the new 900 MHZ
> cordless phones use???
>
> Please write me direct on Internet at:
>
> mittchell@leotech.mv.com
>
> Thanks!!!!
>
> Scott
> =====

Yup.. they run from 902-928MHz Spread Spectrum.

As an aside, I was talking with a rep from AT&T Business Group who was informing us that as of January 1994 or so they'd be coming out with a wireless office system. It's for use on their Partner(tm) and Partner Plus(tm) systems as of right now. It uses, of course, 902-928MHz. It's not like we really utilize the 33cm band to it's full potential but it's still sad to see it go.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
       \      / system @ hades.cdp.org                Soon W5YI VE
        \__/_/
```

```

      -----(oo)      Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
    /|  -----  \|
  / | {MTV}||      MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* ||{___}||
  ||-----||      (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----

```

```

-----

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 20:03:49 GMT
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!npirs!dheisler@purdue.edu
Subject: I LOVE CW!!!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```

by jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones):

```

> say to you, I LOVE CW!!!! HAHAAHAHAHA THEY WILL HAVE TO PRY THE KEY FROM
> MY COLD DEAD FINGERS BEFORE I'LL EVER STOP DOING CW. HAHAAHAHAHA
> Thank you. 8-)

```

betty ford clinic has a room for ya, they just called.

d

```

-----

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 18:20:21 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbfsb!cbnews!cbnewst!cbnewsm!jeffj@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: I LOVE CW!!!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```

I stand before you today my fellow CW lovers with a confession to make. I have strayed! Yes, indeed, I have strayed. In a moment of weakness I picked up my microphone and spoke upon the air. The shame that I felt was simply overwhelming. For speaking on the air I have given the anti-CW types added ammunition for their wishfull thinking that CW is a dying mode. I was simply frustrated at not being able to find a quiet spot upon which to call CQ in our crowded CW segment of the band. I searched and searched to no avail and so in a moment of pique I went to a quiet portion of the phone band (of which there are many) and called CQ. There I had a nice ragchew with another ham like many that I have had on CW. However it didn't have that same feeling as a good ragchew on CW. So as I stand here before you I promise to almost never transgress upon the phone portions again. I have only one more thing to say to you, I LOVE CW!!!! HAHAAHAHAHA THEY WILL HAVE TO PRY THE KEY FROM MY COLD DEAD FINGERS BEFORE I'LL EVER STOP DOING CW. HAHAAHAHAHA

Thank you. 8-)

Jeff

Trying to get some humor into this newsgroup once again. 8-)

--

```
Jeff Jones  AB6MB          |  OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com    |  Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929 |  Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?
```

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 22:14:13 GMT
From: mdisea!mothost!lmpsbbs!sce16.comm.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: MOTOROLA
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9310071900.AA26243@ucsd.edu>, rrossi@vnet.IBM.COM (Ronald D. Rossi) wrote:

```
> >Date sent: 7-OCT-1993 05:08:01
> >John asked that I repost this msg to the infohams. Please respond,if you wish
> >, to his packet address.
> >-----
> >>From : N1NRA @ KD2AJ
> >>Msgid : PN 2460@KD2AJ $2460_KD2AJ
> >>Subject : Posting for Internet <MOTOROLA>
> >>
> >> I find myself just a bit distressed by the amount of flack being thrown ...
> >Is patent/copyright issue? If so, I bought the device and now own
> >its contents. I can delete or add "things" to my heart's content
> >as long as I stay within emission regulations, etc.
>
> /=====
> / IBM Microelectronics Internet: rrossi@vnet.ibm.com /
> / H/P ASIC SRAM Design VNET: RROSSI at BTVLABVM /
> / Dept N93 Bldg 861-2 Voice: 802/796-7477 /
> / 1000 River Road RF: N1PBT /
> / Essex Junction, VT 05452-4299 /
> / /
> / "I work for IBM, I don't represent its views!" /
> / /
> /=====
```

So does this mean that you feel it is alright to modify those files on my IBM mainframe that tell the operating system that I have paid the yearly license fee?

Or I wonder if the guy posting from DEC the other day would mind if I modify the login program on my Decstation to allow more than two simultaneous users without paying DEC for the privilege? Once I make the modifications, I am sure DEC wouldn't mind if I post it to the Internet.

Nobody is going to write new Motorola radio software from scratch. There is no way that they would make enough money from it to recoup their Engineering investment. As for doing it as a home project --Find a team of 100 software engineers who want to spend their personal time behind a work station for a year. I won't be volunteering for that assignment.

Motorola doesn't have a problem with business radio equipment being used in the ham bands or with hardware field modifications to the equipment. The problem is people hacking software to turn on features which Motorola paid to write, but that the customer hasn't paid to use. I have seen cases where the software interactions from having several features turned on that were never designed to be used together caused equipment or system problems. Not to mention that changing codeplug bits in a radio is a good way to wind up with a radio that will only power up and display the error "FAIL 01/82" (corrupt radio EEPROM).

--

John Gilbert johng@ecs.comm.mot.com Motorola SmartZone Trunked
Systems

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 16:41:20 GMT
From: mdisea!mothost!lmpsbbs!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 4636@anomaly.sbs.com, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

{In article <1993Oct7.161639.1483@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com>,

{ burke_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

{

{|> That should have been more correctly explained as "tamering with it to

{|> make a living/profit from it is a crime." Sorry, Bruce, WB4YUC, el YUCCO. . .

{

{If I know that changing byte 3, bit 6, from a 0 to a 1 enables full-band

{receive on a Motorola radio, and a local public-works department hires

{me to modify their radios, I still fail to understand how this is a

{"crime".

Because you have given the customer something he hasn't paid for and you are making a living from it.

}

}Sorry, but for all your claims of "Its a crime! Its a crime!", I've yet
}to see one solid, well reasoned explanation of why Motorola radios are
}viewed somehow "different" with regard to copyright laws than other
}instruments, such as books. You have failed to provide any
}evidence that any modifications I would make are "criminal", since
}clearly, copyright laws indicate that I am free to make changes to
}a copyrighted item for my own use. Furthermore, copyright law
}does not prohibit me from making taking my modifications and
}publishing them for other people to use, nor does copyright law
}prevent me from taking other people's copies and making my
}changes, if they want me to.

Yes copyright laws do apply when it comes to altering computer code and
then ytrying to make a living from it. And while we are at it -
every time you sing Happy Birthday, technically you owe someone a royalty
because that somg is copyrighted! As for books, go ahead and pull a chapter out of
one and try to republish it with your name on it and watch what happens!

}
}Since I've never owned a Motorola radio, I don't know how the
}purchasing agreement is handled. If Motorola were to "license"
}their radios to me, and in that license agreement it said that I
}can only have Motorola modify the radio, if I had it modified,
}then I would be in violation of the license. The person who made
}the modification would in no way be a party to what is clearly a
}civil matter.

}
}The point about "copyright" is irrelevant, because, as people have
}already said, 3rd party modification of Motorola radios is perfectly
}legal and does not violate any "copyright" restrictions.

People, which people?? Define modify.... tweaking a circuit is one thing.

Messing with the computer code for profit is another.

}
}
}Quite frankly, Motorola's position is complete bullshit. It appears
}to me that Motorola is attempting to enforce some form of
}"licensing" system through copyright laws, and that's not what copyright
}were intended for. Furthermore, it appears that Motorola is attempting
}to redefine a civil matter as a criminal act.

}
}And Bruce, instead of simply spouting the party line in the group, you
}may actually want to take some classes on copyright law and learn something
}about that which you purport to speak.

}

You are the one who needs to study, you obviously don't understand what the issue
is.

There are all kinds of protected items within a radio. Proprietary IC's are one. So is the computer code which makes the radio what it is. When you buy a radio that is driven by a microprocessor and computer code, you are not buying the code and that is where many people think they know better. You are merely being licenced to use it. The company still retains ownership of it. Just like going out and buying sheet music or a book.

As for what side I stand on, that is my business. If you don't like it, fine, but you can't tell me where to stand on an issue.

Bruce Burke, WB4YUC, e1 YUCCO. . .

```
}MD
}
}--
}-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ          -
}-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com    -  Providence Firefighters Association:
}--      UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz -  We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet
}--  AT&TNet: 401-273-4669              -
```

Date: 8 Oct 93 16:38:17 CDT
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 17669@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com, burke_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

|In article 4636@anomaly.sbs.com, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

|}If I know that changing byte 3, bit 6, from a 0 to a 1 enables full-band
|}receive on a Motorola radio, and a local public-works department hires
|}me to modify their radios, I still fail to understand how this is a
|}"crime".

|
|Because you have given the customer something he hasn't paid for and
|you are making a living from it.

Wait a minute. If the customer has paid Michael, then they aren't getting something they didn't pay for. ;^)

You seem to be saying that Michael is "selling his brothers horse". I am not convinced this is the case.

If only Motorola can sell you something, then clearly Motorola must be the

owner of that something, or must be given the authority by the owner to sell it.

What that something is, in this case, is the right to transmit and receive on frequencies that are blocked on the customer's radio because of the software in the radio. Now it seems to me that as long as the customer has a valid FCC licence for those frequencies, the customer has the right to broadcast and receive on those frequencies. Motorola cannot sell a right (or a privilege) which the FCC has granted.

On the other hand, it may be argued that what Motorola is selling is a service. The service of modifying the radio. Now what law would grant to Motorola the sole right to that service?

Copyright law? I don't believe it!
Patent law? Certainly not!

Laws governing trade secrets? Yes, only if those trade secrets had been violated by the servicing party. This should cover the case where someone stole the technology and sought to make a profit?

Laws governing contracts? Yes, if the sale contract stipulated that only Motorola had these rights, and if such contract were held valid in the state of the customer.

(Usually if information is public knowledge, it can't be considered a trade secret.

like magazine articles etc. In other words if John Q Smith, happens to have figured out that he can change an address and extend the coverage how has he violated any agreement to maintain a trade secret?)

|Yes copyright laws do apply when it comes to altering computer code and
|then trying to make a living from it. And while we are at it -
|every time you sing Happy Birthday, technically you owe someone a royalty
|because that song is copyrighted! As for books, go ahead and pull a chapter out
of
|one and try to republish it with your name on it and watch what happens!

We are not talking about republishing or copying. We are talking about modifying a legitimately obtained copy.

Even in the case where we are talking about making copies:

No you cannot modify a song or a book and then publish it and make money. That would be a violation of a copyright. What you can do is start over

from scratch and write your own book and sell that.

(I can't believe any copyright law prohibits anyone from reading a book aloud or singing a song aloud. Of course we could get into freedom of speech issues here.)

|tweaking a circuit is one thing.

|

|Messing with the computer code for profit is another.

Why would software be more protected than hardware? Hardware can be patented and software (generally) cannot. Patents (generally) offer more protection than copyrights. But even Patents do not prohibit the customer from making personal modifications, or hiring whoever they please to make modifications.

Does Motorola become offended if customers hire third parties to modify the hardware in their radios? Suppose they could extend the transmit range? Have they obtained something they have not paid for? What then? All they have bought from Motorola is a radio! (Unless they also bought a contract for certain services as with cell phone, where a modification of a radio might well give them access to services they have not paid for. This is another issue. I have not seen any postings that indicated that this was the source of the concern behind the QST add.)

|You are the one who needs to study, you obviously don't understand what the issue is.

We would be happy to have you enlighten us. ;^)

|There are all kinds of protected items within a radio. Proprietary IC's are one.
|So is the computer code which makes the radio what it is. When you buy a radio

But how far can that protection extend? Can it prohibit someone else from writing competitive computer code? Not by copyright! (IBM would have loved it if the only software that could legally run on the IBM PC were IBM software!) Can it prohibit the owner from making a modification? Not by patent.

|that is driven by a microprocessor and computer code, you are not buying the code
|and that is where many people think they know better. You are merely being
|licenced to use it. The company still retains ownership of it. Just like

Yes contracts, leases, and licences can provide some protection. It seems that perhaps the only way out of this mess is for a third party to write and sell their own software designed to run on Motorola radios. ;^) As mentioned, some recent Supreme Court decisions have seen a limit on this protection, like with restrictions against reverse-engineering.

|going out and buying sheet music or a book.
 ^^^^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^^

Hmm, can a book publisher prohibit you from making notes in the margins of a book you buy or sheet music? Would the Court dare go that far?

I won't be surprised at all if this ends up in the Supreme Court! (No, I don't intend to be one of the litigants. ;^)

|Bruce Burke, WB4YUC, e1 YUCCO. . .

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

Kilo Golf Zero India Oscar -(KG0IO)-

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 22:27:35 EST
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

burke_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

> Tony, you seem to forget that there are millions of dollars poured into
> the development of new radios, the company certainly has the right to charge
> for
> whatever they develop. So get back on base and think what you would do if
> it was YOUR company that had to make a PROFIT!

No, it's you who needs to get back on base. You think Motorola doesn't reap the profits when they just sell you the 'base' model? Of course they do! Then they rape you twice by changing a jumper and opening up those "expanded" features. Hmmmmm.....

Are you one of those people who doesn't challenge a law?

Tony

 o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
 \ / system @ hades.cdp.org Soon W5YI VE
 ___/
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
 / | _____ \
 / | {MTV} | |
* | | {___} | | MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's

||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
^^ ^^

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 22:24:39 EST
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

burke_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

> In article 10380@cs.brown.edu, md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (System Operator) writ
> es:
> }In article <ab5_9310020805@yyz.mbsun.mlb.org>, mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Kar
> l.Beckman (Karl Beckman) writes:
> }
> }|> As just one of 100,000+ employees, I'm guessing that the issue is one
> }|> of SOFTWARE PIRACY, that is the modification of Motorola's copyrighted
> }|> computer code used in most new radios. Specifically, to add features
> }|> without paying for them and to extend the coverage beyond the design
> }|> limits of the unit. I think Scott was right on both his comments.
> }
> }Err, I must be missing something...
> }
> }If I buy a computer, and decide to modify the firmware to
> }give my system added capability, that is hardly "Software
> }Piracy".
> }
> }I fail to see how, all things being equal, the modification
> }of firmware within a Motorola radio is considered "software
> }piracy".
> }
> }If you build additional features into the radio, and attempt
> }to circumvent them through software control, and someone
> }discovers this by reverse-engineering and publishes the
> }"fixes", I again fail to see how this is considered
> }"software piracy".
> }
> }Perhaps you'd like to explain in a little more detail
> }the reasoning?
>
> The firmware is all copyrighted, tampering with it is a crime!
>
> Bruce, WB4YUC

No it's not! You're not doing it for any monetary gain. And you DO own the unit. Tamper away! As long as you don't change the code around and then try to sell it off as your own, it doesn't violate copyright laws.

I'm glad you're not in charge of enforcing the law... we'd all be in trouble then. (Forgive us Hamtronics for we have modified your REP-200 firmware to add features such as paging, cw AND voice ID, etc.)

Tony

```
-----
      o      o  Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      /  system @ hades.cdp.org                      Soon W5YI VE
      \____/
      (oo)  Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ____  \
 / | {MTV} ||  MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || {____} ||
  ||-----||  (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----
```

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 1993 18:37:15 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!udel!gvls1!rossi@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Temporary IDs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <29494rINN1rh@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>I would guess that the FCC does not care, and I suspect that this, and worse,
>happens a lot. There are plenty of Extra class ops who kept their Novice
>calls, and a no-code Tech could operate in the Extra portion of the phone
>bands for a long time without being challenged. I know of a novice (or Tech,
>I forget) who did the phone Sprint a while back, using an amp on 20/40-80m.

If you can make yourself sound like you belong there then very few people would ever question it.

Back in the mid/early 70's I knew a guy [older] who did not have his Extra however he had a legit 1x2 call. He somehow got it since he had one back in the 20's or something.. I forget the details. Anyway. He used to operate down in the Extra CW segments all the time... Until one day the FCC caught him down there during one of the CW DX contests. I forget the details but he ended up taking his Extra test shortly after that..

Date: (null)

From: (null)

In this case, it was not intentional. His dial calibration was just a tad off and he just got too close to the band edge... But they **were** out looking..

You never know who is listening.

=====
Pete Rossi - WA3NNA

rossi@vfl.paramax.COM

Unisys Corporation - Government Systems Group

Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania
=====

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1200
